REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on July 25, 2008, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 1, 10, 14, 17, 23, and 29 are amended, claims 12 and 13 are canceled, and no claims are added; as a result, claims 1-11 and 14-32 are now pending in this application.

§ 112 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-11, and 14-16 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being allegedly indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner stated that the following terms are not clear: "a computer device, comprising:" on line 1 of claim 1; and "a computer device including" on line 2 of claim 10.

Applicant has endeavored to overcome the rejection by amending independent claims 1 and 10 to include a processor and memory which should resolve the Examiner's issues with these claims and claims 2-9 and 11 and 14-16 which depend therefrom. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 112 rejection of claims 1-11, and 14-16.

§ 102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1, 17, 23, and 29 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kung et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0217188). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection as follows. The Applicants do not admit that Anderson is indeed prior art with respect to the present application and reserve the option to antedate the reference.

The Kung et al. reference does not appear to teach an interface module that processes application instructions to select either, one of a first number of APIs (e.g., that are resident on an operating system layer) or one of a second number of APIs (e.g., that are designed for use of the application on a second type of

Rev. 01/08

operating system and are resident on the interface module). In contrast,

Applicant's independent claim 1, as amended, recites, among other things,

> an operating system layer having <u>executable instructions to provide</u> a first type of operating system and associated application program interfaces (APIs), <u>wherein the associated APIs include a first number of APIs for operating on the first type of operating system that is resident on the computing device</u>; and
> an interface module coupled between the application layer and the operating system layer, <u>wherein the interface module includes a second number of APIs for operating with a second type of operating system that is not the type of operating system resident on the computing device and</u> wherein the interface module receives program instructions from a program in the application layer written for <u>the</u> second type of operating system and processes the instructions <u>to select either, one of the first number of APIs or one of the second number of APIs.</u>

Applicant's independent claim 17, as amended, recites, among other things,

> providing an application <u>via an application layer having executable instructions to provide one or more applications to</u> an operating system <u>layer having executable instructions to provide a first type of operating system and associated application program interfaces (APIs), wherein the associated APIs include a first number of APIs for operating on the first type of operating system that is resident on the computing device;</u>
> communicating instructions <u>stored in memory and executable on a processor</u> from the application to an interface module, wherein the interface module includes:
> > a second number of APIs for operating the home location register application with a second type of operating system that is not the type of operating system resident on the computing device and wherein the interface module receives program instructions from the application in the application layer written for the second type of operating system and processes the instructions to select either, one of the first number of APIs or one of the second number of APIs.

Applicant's independent claim 23, as amended, recites, among other things,

> interpreting the instructions from the application with the interface module <u>by receiving program instructions from the application and processing the instructions to select either, one of a first number of APIs that are designed for use of the application on the first type of operating system and wherein the first number of APIs are resident on an operating system layer or one of a second number of APIs that are designed for use</u>

of the application on the second type of operating system and wherein the
second number of APIs are resident on the interface module.

And, Applicant's independent claim 29, as amended, recites, among other things,

processing the instructions from the telecommunication application
with the interface module by receiving program instructions from the
application and processing the instructions to select either, one of a first
number of APIs that are designed for use of the application on the first type
of operating system and wherein the first number of APIs are resident on
an operating system layer or one of a second number of APIs that are
designed for use of the application on a second type of operating system
and wherein the second number of APIs are resident on the interface
module.

As such, Applicant submits that the Kung et al. reference does not teach each and
every element recited in Applicant's independent claims 1, 17, 23, and 29, as amended.
Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the above § 102 rejection for these
claims, as well as those claims which depend therefrom, is respectfully requested.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1, 17, 23, and 29 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being
unpatentable over Wentz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,553,429) in view of Hutchison et al.
(U.S. Patent No. 6,651,123). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection as follows.

The Wentz et al. reference does not appear to teach an interface module that
processes application instructions to select either, one of a first number of APIs (e.g., that
are resident on an operating system layer) or one of a second number of APIs (e.g., that
are designed for use of the application on a second type of operating system and are
resident on the interface module). Further, the Hutchinson et al. reference does not
appear to cure the deficiencies of the Wentz et al. reference.

In contrast, Applicant's independent claim 1, as amended, recites, among other
things,

an operating system layer having executable instructions to provide
a first type of operating system and associated application program
interfaces (APIs), wherein the associated APIs include a first number of

APIs for operating on the first type of operating system that is resident on the computing device; and

an interface module coupled between the application layer and the operating system layer, wherein the interface module includes a second number of APIs for operating with a second type of operating system that is not the type of operating system resident on the computing device and wherein the interface module receives program instructions from a program in the application layer written for the second type of operating system and processes the instructions to select either, one of the first number of APIs or one of the second number of APIs.

Applicant's independent claim 17, as amended, recites, among other things,

providing an application via an application layer having executable instructions to provide one or more applications to an operating system layer having executable instructions to provide a first type of operating system and associated application program interfaces (APIs), wherein the associated APIs include a first number of APIs for operating on the first type of operating system that is resident on the computing device;

communicating instructions stored in memory and executable on a processor from the application to an interface module, wherein the interface module includes:

a second number of APIs for operating the home location register application with a second type of operating system that is not the type of operating system resident on the computing device and wherein the interface module receives program instructions from the application in the application layer written for the second type of operating system and processes the instructions to select either, one of the first number of APIs or one of the second number of APIs.

Applicant's independent claim 23, as amended, recites, among other things,

interpreting the instructions from the application with the interface module by receiving program instructions from the application and processing the instructions to select either, one of a first number of APIs that are designed for use of the application on the first type of operating system and wherein the first number of APIs are resident on an operating system layer or one of a second number of APIs that are designed for use of the application on the second type of operating system and wherein the second number of APIs are resident on the interface module.

And, Applicant's independent claim 29, as amended, recites, among other things,

processing the instructions from the telecommunication application with the interface module by receiving program instructions from the

application and processing the instructions to select either, one of a first
number of APIs that are designed for use of the application on the first type
of operating system and wherein the first number of APIs are resident on
an operating system layer or one of a second number of APIs that are
designed for use of the application on a second type of operating system
and wherein the second number of APIs are resident on the interface
module.

As such, Applicant submits that the Wentz et al. and Hutchinson et al. references
do not teach or suggest, separately or in combination, each and every element recited in
Applicant's independent claims 1, 17, 23, and 29, as amended. Accordingly,
reconsideration and withdrawal of the above § 103 rejection for these claims, as well as
those claims which depend therefrom, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 5-9, and 17-28 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being
unpatentable over Nowlin, Jr., et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,484,309) in view of Hutchison et
al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,651,123). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection as follows.

The Nowlin, Jr., et al. reference does not appear to teach an interface module that
processes application instructions to select either, one of a first number of APIs (e.g., that
are resident on an operating system layer) or one of a second number of APIs (e.g., that
are designed for use of the application on a second type of operating system and are
resident on the interface module). Further, the Hutchinson et al. reference does not
appear to cure the deficiencies of the Nowlin, Jr., et al. reference.

In contrast, Applicant's independent claim 1, as amended, recites, among other
things,

> an operating system layer having executable instructions to provide
> a first type of operating system and associated application program
> interfaces (APIs), wherein the associated APIs include a first number of
> APIs for operating on the first type of operating system that is resident on
> the computing device; and
> an interface module coupled between the application layer and the
> operating system layer, wherein the interface module includes a second
> number of APIs for operating with a second type of operating system that
> is not the type of operating system resident on the computing device and
> wherein the interface module receives program instructions from a
> program in the application layer written for the second type of operating

Rev. 01/08

system and processes the instructions <u>to select either, one of the first number of APIs or one of the second number of APIs.</u>

Applicant's independent claim 17, as amended, recites, among other things,

> providing an application <u>via an application layer having executable instructions to provide one or more applications to</u> an operating system <u>layer having executable instructions to provide a first type of operating system and associated application program interfaces (APIs), wherein the associated APIs include a first number of APIs for operating on the first type of operating system that is resident on the computing device;</u>
> communicating instructions <u>stored in memory and executable on a processor</u> from the application to an interface module, wherein the interface module includes:
> > <u>a second number of APIs for operating the home location register application with a second type of operating system that is not the type of operating system resident on the computing device and wherein the interface module receives program instructions from the application in the application layer written for the second type of operating system and processes the instructions to select either, one of the first number of APIs or one of the second number of APIs.</u>

Applicant's independent claim 23, as amended, recites, among other things,

> interpreting the instructions from the application with the interface module <u>by receiving program instructions from the application and processing the instructions to select either, one of a first number of APIs that are designed for use of the application on the first type of operating system and wherein the first number of APIs are resident on an operating system layer or one of a second number of APIs that are designed for use of the application on the second type of operating system and wherein the second number of APIs are resident on the interface module.</u>

As such, Applicant submits that the Nowlin, Jr., et al. and Hutchinson et al. references do not teach or suggest, separately or in combination, each and every element recited in Applicant's independent claims 1, 17, and 23, as amended. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the above § 103 rejection for these claims, as well as those claims which depend therefrom, is respectfully requested.

Claims 4, 10, 11, 14-16, and 29-32 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nowlin, Jr., et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,484,309) in view of Hutchison et

al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,651,123) and further in view of Fletcher et al. (U.S. Statutory

Invention Registration No. H1,921). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection as

follows.

The Nowlin, Jr., et al. reference does not appear to teach an interface module that

processes application instructions to select either, one of a first number of APIs (e.g., that

are resident on an operating system layer) or one of a second number of APIs (e.g., that

are designed for use of the application on a second type of operating system and are

resident on the interface module). Further, the Hutchinson et al. and Fletcher et al.

references do not appear to cure the deficiencies of the Nowlin, Jr., et al. reference.

In contrast, Applicant's independent claim 10, as amended, recites, among other

things,

> an operating system layer having <u>executable instructions to provide</u>
> a first type of operating system <u>and associated application program</u>
> <u>interfaces (APIs), wherein the associated APIs include a first number of</u>
> <u>APIs for operating on the first type of operating system that is resident on</u>
> <u>the computing device;</u> and
> an interface module <u>coupled between the application layer and the</u>
> <u>operating system layer, wherein the interface module includes a second</u>
> <u>number of APIs for operating the home location register application with a</u>
> <u>second type of operating system that is not the type of operating system</u>
> <u>resident on the computing device and wherein the interface module</u>
> <u>receives program instructions from the home location register application</u>
> <u>in the application layer written for the second type of operating system and</u>
> <u>processes the instructions to select either, one of the first number of APIs</u>
> <u>or one of the second number of APIs.</u>

And, Applicant's independent claim 29, as amended, recites, among other things,

> processing the instructions from the telecommunication application
> with the interface module <u>by receiving program instructions from the</u>
> <u>application and processing the instructions to select either, one of a first</u>
> <u>number of APIs that are designed for use of the application on the first</u>
> <u>type of operating system and wherein the first number of APIs are resident</u>
> <u>on an operating system layer or one of a second number of APIs that are</u>
> <u>designed for use of the application on a second type of operating system</u>
> <u>and wherein the second number of APIs are resident on the interface</u>
> <u>module.</u>

As such, Applicant submits that the Nowlin, Jr., et al. and Hutchinson et al. references do not teach or suggest, separately or in combination, each and every element recited in Applicant's independent claims 1, 17, and 23, as amended. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the above § 103 rejection for these claims, as well as those claims which depend therefrom, is respectfully requested.

Rev. 01/08

Application No. 10/692,939
Amendment dated October 13, 2008
Reply to Office Action of July 25, 2008

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' attorney Jeffery L. Cameron at (612) 236-0121 to facilitate prosecution of this matter.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to the Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR §1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office facsimile number (571) 273-8300 on this 13 day of October 2008.

Jennifer L Vomhof
Name

Signature

Respectfully Submitted,
James A. Lamb, et al.

By Applicants' Representatives,
Brooks, Cameron & Huebsch, PLLC
1221 Nicollet Avenue, Suite 500
Minneapolis, MN 55403

By: _____
Jeffery L. Cameron
Reg. No. 43,527

Date: 10/13/08

Rev. 01/08

Page 18 of 18

PAGE 20/20 * RCVD AT 10/13/2008 4:34:46 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-5/16 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:6126599344 * DURATION (mm-ss):03-40